

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: BBA5024A805A608085257872005D5893

From: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Delivered Date: 02/11/2009 11:21 AM EDT

Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

OK - I'll take a look at the details. On that note, we may have some duplication with the Demob C&D cost (e.g., removal of Rubb building); I'll make sure we are not counting activities twice.

Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 11:16 AM

To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita

Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

Anita - we may want to discuss this further with the team. This prep. for Area C was assuming we'd be moving 400,000+ cy of sand out of the UHCC using Area C, so we don't really have to follow this model if we're just moving dredged sediment to the LHCC. We certainly do need to demob Area C, however, so maybe its a wash..

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"

<Anita.Rigassio-
Smith@jacobs.com
>

To

Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

02/11/2009 10:59

AM

est. at \$80m

Subject

RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost

See the 6th page in (Section titled "Steps 4 and 5") for the description of the marine equipment and preparation of Area C.

Call if you need.

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 9:16 AM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

OK - maybe it DOESN'T include Corps oversight!

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"
<Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>
To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
cc:

02/11/2009 08:26 AM
Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

Hi Dave,

I've attached the e-mail I used for the dollar value. I can enter any number you want.

Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2009 8:20 AM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

thanks Anita. Not to beat a dead horse but it occurred to me after i

sent the email that the Marsh Isle cost est. is "loaded" so maybe a lower cost would be appropriate, if you're adding fixed costs on top of it??

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"

<Anita.Rigassio-
Smith@jacobs.com
>

To
Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
cc

02/10/2009 05:20
PM
est. at \$80m

Subject
RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost

Hi Dave,

Good catch on the Marsh Is cost. I inadvertently switched the Marsh Is resto (should be \$2.75M per your 12/15/08 e-mail) with the Nstar crossing (\$1.2M per 2007 estimate provided to NAE). I'll switch those and re-send the spreadsheet.

The \$1.8M for "Preparing Area C" is a cost we have been carrying since Alternative 2 and provides for removal of temporary structures, capping utilities, re-routing drainage, etc. so that the mechanical dredging activities can be based out of Area C.

When we changed from perimeter sheet pile wall to silt curtain in the October 2008 version of Alternative 4 we used the same daily rate (assuming similar equipment, operators, and laborers) but reduced the number of days to install from 72 to 30 (i.e., 6 weeks).

We can discuss these more tomorrow if you'd like.

Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2009 4:38 PM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

Hi Anita - just a couple of quick things:

- the cost est. I have for Marsh Island is \$2.6m in 2007\$, not the \$1.2m
- what is the \$1.8m for "Prep Area C" in year 3?
- \$5m for silt curtain instal seems steep, is this more of place holder or do you have a better basis for this?

Thanks!

Dave

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"
<Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>
>
Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
02/10/2009 01:44
PM
<Maurice.Beaudoin@usace.army.mil>
, "Leitch, Robert A NAE"
<Robert.A.Leitch@usace.army.mil>,
"L'Heureux, Paul G NAE"
<Paul.G.L'Heureux@usace.army.mil>
, ElaineT
Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, "Fox,
Steve \ (New Bedford\)"
<Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>, "Gouveia,
Mark" <Mark.Gouveia@jacobs.com>,
"Anderson, Michael \ (Boston\)"
<Michael.Anderson@jacobs.com>
Subject
RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost
est. at \$80m

Attached is the "draft concept plan" KC mentioned in his e-mail earlier today. We can use this to discuss some conceptual questions for formulating the scenario, such as:

- 1) Does the sequence of activities make sense?
- 2) Do we want to limit ourselves to dollars or days? Some activities will have to be staffed with double-shifts in order to utilize the \$80M/year.
- 3) Once all TSCA material is dredged, what are our finishing steps? Final clean-up passes? Capping with sand? Should these activities be included?
- 4) Others?

When reviewing the attached spreadsheet, keep in mind that costs are rough and for scoping purposes only. The costs will be refined once the concept is formulated.

Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: Mitkevicius, K C NAE [mailto:K.C.Mitkevicius@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2009 10:28 AM
To: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Beaudoin, Maurice NAE; Leitch, Robert A NAE; L'Heureux, Paul G NAE; stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov; Fox, Steve (New Bedford); Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: RE: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

Dave,
In talking to Anita, both milestones - the \$80m hybrid cost est by end of Feb and the 2 CAD Cell approach by end of March are doable. Anita will be sending out an email by COB today with a draft concept plan for getting the estimates completed that can be used for further discussions during tomorrow's conference call.

KC

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 5:00 PM
To: Mitkevicius, K C NAE; Beaudoin, Maurice NAE; Leitch, Robert A NAE; L'Heureux, Paul G NAE; steve.fox@jacobs.com; anita.rigassio-smith@jacobs.com
Cc: Catri.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov; Peterson.David@epamail.epa.gov;

Ng.ManChak@epamail.epa.gov; Gutro.Doug@epamail.epa.gov;
Brill.Larry@epamail.epa.gov; Falvey.Jeanethe@epamail.epa.gov;
stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: schedule for "hybrid" cost est. at \$80m

REDACTED

Thanks - Dave

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.
[attachment "Set Up Activities.xls" deleted by Dave
Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US]

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

----- Message from <dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov> on Mon, 15 Dec 2008 11:52:48 -0500 -----

To: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

cc: "Paul G NAE L'Heureux"
<Paul.G.L'Heureux@nae02.usace.army.mil>

Subject: RE: Alt. 4 cost estimate follow-up

Anita - we have a Mar 2007 estimate of \$2.61 million, NOT including Corps oversight. Gary had suggested adding another \$100,000 for this to be on the safe side. So maybe we call it \$2.75m in 2007 dollars, and escalate it appropriately depending on the year that it fits into the Alt. 4 schedule.

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"
<Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>
>
"Paul G NAE L'Heureux"
12/12/2008 04:21 PM
Subject
RE: Alt. 4 cost estimate
follow-up

To
Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
CC
<Paul.G.L'Heureux@nae02.usace.army.mil>

Hi Dave,

Would you forward the Marsh Island estimate to me? I'd like to see the assumptions so I know how to incorporate the work into the Alt. 4 estimate.

Thank you.
Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 11, 2008 5:14 PM
To: Peterson.David@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Catri.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov; stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov;
K.C.Mitkevicius@nae02.usace.army.mil; maurice.beaudoin@usace.army.mil;
Robert.A.Leitch@usace.army.mil; paul.g.l'heureux@usace.army.mil; Fox,
Steve
(New Bedford); Gouveia, Mark; Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: Re: Alt. 4 cost estimate follow-up

Dave P. makes a good point, one that was overlooked. Currently the wetland MUs do NOT include the Marsh Island work. I suppose the best fit would be to include this ~\$3m effort (the corps did an estimate which I'll forward if need be) in #4 below (i.e., AFTER the dredging for the LHCC has been completed to minimize recontamination).

Thanks - Dave

David
Peterson/R1/USEPA/US
PA/US
Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
12/11/2008
04:55 PM
Cynthia Catri/R1/USEPA/US@EPA,
ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject
Re: Alt. 4 cost estimate follow-up
(Document link: Dave Dickerson)

Is there any contingent for expediting the Marsh Island work, depending on the land trust/Trustees' schedule for their restoration work?

Dave
Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US
EPA/US
steve.fox@jacobs.com,
12/11/2008
04:44 PM
K.C.Mitkevicius@nae02.usace.army.mil,
maurice.beaudoin@usace.army.mil,
Robert.A.Leitch@usace.army.mil,
paul.g.l'heureux@usace.army.mil,
ElaineT Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
Cynthia Catri/R1/USEPA/US@EPA,
ManChak Ng/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Larry
Brill/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, David
Peterson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

Alt. 4 cost estimate follow-up

All - as a follow up from Tuesday's meeting, lets go with the following approach:

1. change the CAD cell sequence so that the LHCC is being excavated in 2010 and 2011 using the additional \$4.5m in these two years (i.e., \$19.5m total in 2010 and 2011). Assume economy of scale results in 300,000 cy of disposal volume.

2. Meanwhile, using the remaining \$15m/year: in 2009 we finish the cove Superfund dredging, and in 2010 and 2011 we demob Areas C and D and purchase the small scows for the upper harbor mech. dredging (as per the existing Alt. 4 estimate).

3. In 2012, escalation of the \$15m begins (i.e. \$15.525m) and FILLING of the LHCC begins (first the upper harbor MUs 25-31 and then the lower harbor MUs). This should be a volume of 272,000 cy (with the offset of 10,000 cy for the ou3 cap). No "tipping fees" for the LHCC as the hole will already have been paid for.

4. Once the LHCC is filled, we start excavating the UHCC. (Hopefully this is in 2014 or 2015 depending on whether it takes two or three years to fill the LHCC.) Assume the remaining volume of "contaminated organic material" of 30,000 cy goes to a LHCC (see Table 5.2-A in the Apex CAD cell report: 70,424 cy minus ~40,000 cy dredged in 2008/2009 = ~30,000 cy).

For the remaining 61,528 cy of "non-contaminated organic material" (Apex's term) in the UHCC, maybe we should assume that this material is used to cap the LHCC (or used as additional cap at the ou3 area). The organics in the cap material are preferable for additional sequestering of dissolved contaminants, but we may need to check on geotechnical issues.

For the excavation of the 422,000 cy of clean S&G from the UHCC, as discussed these would be sent to the CCDS (most likely by truck to Area D and then loaded on to large scows). (the LHCC capping concept discussed at the meeting for this material would already have happened using the clean organics immediately above)

5. Once the UHCC is excavated, we fill it, and then move on to the shoreline/wetland cleanups.

6. For lack of a more specific plan, lets assume that cell #1 gets

emptied and the pilot CDF (aka the DDA) gets capped as the last activity after the wetland cleanups.

Please let me know if you see anything I missed!

Thanks - Dave

p.s. remember this is just a scenario for cost estimating purposes: if for some reason we get more funding we would likely put the UHCC on a parallel track with the LHCC, and perhaps deal with cell #1 and/or the pilot CDF earlier...

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

(See attached file: Draft Conceptual Estimate - Alternative #2 - CAD Cell Approach.pdf)

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.